



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,859	02/09/2004	Shun C. Fung	2004B008	9496
7590	04/13/2005			EXAMINER
ExxonMobil Chemical Company Law Technology P.O. Box 2149 Baytown, TX 77522-2149			WOOD, ELIZABETH D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1755	

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/774,859	FUNG ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Elizabeth D. Wood	1755	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1, 3-38 and 40-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 38, 40-49 and 66 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1, 3-37, 50-65 and 67 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/9/04.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Specification***

The examiner has not checked the specification to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors (grammatical, typographical and idiomatic). Cooperation of the applicant(s) is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant(s) may become aware of in the specification, in the claims and in any future amendment(s) that applicant(s) may file.

Applicant(s) is also requested to complete the status of any copending applications referred to in the specification by their Attorney Docket Number or Application Serial Number, if any.

The status of the parent application(s) and/or any other application(s) cross-referenced to this application, if any, should be updated in a timely manner.

***Election/Restriction***

Applicants' election of Group I, claims 1, 3-37, 50-65 and 67, in the reply filed on February 22, 2005 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 3-37, 50-65 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any one of US 2002/0013505 to Fung et al., US 6,023,005 to Lattner et al., US 2002/0169067 to Janssen et al., or US 2003/0231999 to Cao et al.

Each of the cited references is considered to disclose processes for the regeneration/activity maintenance of SAPO molecular sieves wherein portions of the catalyst are withdrawn, the coke is removed and the catalyst is readmitted to the reactor so as to maximize catalyst activity during processing.

The only difference between the instantly claimed process and that of the prior art would appear to be that the instant claims recite the specific percentage of coke on the regenerated and coked catalyst materials, whereas the references are silent with respect to these amounts. However, the examiner takes the position that the instantly claimed process would have been obvious because the skilled artisan would be more than capable of determining the relative necessary amounts of coke on new and regenerated catalyst required to maintain effective activity, catalyst lifetime and so forth. In fact, such is considered to be a classic example of a result-effective variable as evidenced by the prior art which teaches that desirable deposits are maintained by selection of appropriate amounts of coke on a portion of the regenerated catalyst which is returned to the reactor with the unregenerated catalyst to maintain a preferred level of coking. The examiner has considered the information set forth in the specification to determine if there is something unexpected associated with selection of these particular figures, but cannot determine anything beyond the same purpose being achieved by the prior art. See particularly page 10 of Cao et al., paragraphs [0060], [0064], [0066] and [0068] of Janssen et al., the abstract and columns 2-6 of Lattner et al. and the abstract and paragraphs [0010], [0011], [0013], [0017], [0022], [0025] and [0032].

Art Unit: 1755

Any minor differences in the limitations of the dependent claims have been considered. This statement is meant to include limitations such as the lifetime of the catalyst or the flow rate of the particles, both of which will naturally flow from the operation of the prior art processes in a manner that maximizes product formation. Methods of cooling are considered to be within the skill of the engineer practicing in this field of technology, as is selection of the location of apparatus.

Furthermore, any such differences are deemed to be result-effective variables that one of ordinary skill in the art would be expected to manipulate to advantage. Additionally, such limitations can be considered to have been simply known as conventional to the artisan practicing in the art at the time the invention was made and/or were common practices which were so well known in the art that they would have been taken for granted. If applicants believe that one or more limitations are critical to the invention, then applicants should amend the claims to reflect such critical limitations as well as indicate where in the specification such critical limitations were discussed and demonstrated.

The limitations of all claims have been considered and are deemed to be within the purview of the prior art.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Applicants should note that the prior art of record is cumulative to that applied in the hereinabove rejections and should be kept in mind when amending the claims.

Applicants are advised that any evidence to be provided under 37 CFR 1.131 or 1.132 and any amendments to the claims and specification should be submitted prior to final rejection to be considered timely. It is anticipated that the next office action will be a final rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth D. Wood whose telephone number is 571-272-1377. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 5:30-2:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571-272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Elizabeth D. Wood  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1755

edw